

**Page Denied**

-2-

has made it impossible in most cases to prosecute. It is the view of the Internal Security Division that the bill as drafted would be sufficiently broad to eliminate the need for disclosure of the information, classified or otherwise, which is involved in the threat to divulge or the so-called extortion.

However, there are a number of objections to the draft bill. First, in charging a person with violation of any such statute it would certainly seem necessary to set forth the type of information which was involved otherwise how could it be established that the information was obtained in the course of employment. Second, in stating broadly "information acquired during his employment by the United States" it is foreseeable information other than "official matter" might be included. For example, a person "during his employment" could acquire information about another employee and attempt to extort money by threatening to reveal such information. Is it intended that this bill should be so broad and encompassing?

Finally, it is doubtful that the Department should sponsor legislation where it appears that there is only one known case which has arisen requiring such sanctions. Although there may have been others, they certainly cannot be numerous.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the Department not include this proposed legislation in its program for the 87th Congress unless there is greater need than is now apparent. If such a need should develop then the language of any draft bill should be limited at least to the type of information now covered by existing statute.

Nancy A. Thompson

Noted and concurred in:

Frank Chambers

Herbert Hoffman